

Examiners' Report
June 2013

GCE History 6HI01 A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2013

Publications Code US036121

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

Once again the vast majority of both centres and candidates are to be congratulated for the thorough preparation of topics studied in Unit 1. The June 2013 examination series showed that most candidates were able to produce a response that showed at least some attempt to provide an analytical framework to their answers. Many produced a response which provided a framework for discussion in the introduction, developed an argument in the main body of the answer, and attempted to reach some form of judgement in the conclusion. However, the most significant differentiators in the awarding of levels and marks were the explicit understanding of the focus of question and the quality of the supporting evidence.

The main features of high-level answers were:

- an initial plan focused on the demands of the question
- the development of a number of relevant points in the body of the answer
- relevant and secure supporting evidence
- an overall judgement in the conclusion
- secure qualities of written communication.

Despite this there are still some areas for improvement. For example, many candidates make general comments which either do not further their argument or which make it clear that the exact nature of the question is not fully understood. A large number of candidates refer to the time period of the question, e.g. '...the years 1939-45...' throughout the whole response as if it is an event rather than a period of time to be analysed. This becomes particularly problematic for questions which require an analysis of change over time as in Options A1, B2 and F13. This trend is also apparent in questions which are focused on two issues or factors, e.g. 'gain and consolidate'; when referred to together as one event it is clear that the focus has not been fully understood. Many candidates also begin their answers by using the phrase 'Many historians believe...' or 'There is a debate amongst historians...' This stock starting device does little to further the response unless reference is made to different historical opinions and as historiographical references are not required within Unit 1, should not be used unless reference to real historical argument or opinion is going to be made.

Most candidates are able to consider with some confidence the features of causation, but many find outcomes and consequences more demanding. This was particularly apparent in Option D, Question 4. Centres should work with candidates to consider the relative importance of consequences of events as well as causes, particularly where the specification clearly suggests that such questions might be set. This also applies to questions which refer to change over time.

Comments on communication skills made in previous reports continue to be relevant. A significant number of candidates struggle both with accurate historical terminology and their deployment within sentences correctly, e.g. '...*this is an example of Mussolini's gain consolidate...*' An increasing number of colloquialisms crept into candidates' answers this summer and should be avoided in a formal examination. A handful of scripts remain very difficult to read, and as legibility is included in strand (i) of the quality of written communication criteria, candidates should be reminded that illegible scripts are not communicating effectively and this may undermine their response.

Question 1

Question 1 focused on the Viking threat to the kingdoms of Anglo-Saxon England in the years 793 – 877 and required consideration of the extent to which that threat changed over time. Less able answers came from those who described the threat during this period, though the broad chronology allowed some implicit analysis of change. More able answers showed a sound knowledge of major events and of some of the key protagonists. These recognised that the Viking threat changed from sporadic coastal raids and overwintering to the establishing of more permanent settlements, which inevitably involved conquest. The more able answers noted the importance of the key changes in the years 865-871. The Great Heathen Army of 865, and the Great Summer Army of 871, clearly intended settlement in England, rather than simple raids on Anglo-Saxon settlements.

Question 2

The level of knowledge displayed in answers to Question 2 was quite impressive overall. Candidates were aware of the key features of Alfred's reign from 878 and there were extensive discussions of military and naval reforms, with developments in both burhs and the fyrd prominent in most answers. Cultural, educational and legal developments were also considered, but there were fewer references to the revival of monasticism and the establishment of good relations with the papacy. Some less able candidates simply considered some of Alfred's reforms with a little evaluation. Many, however, spotted that the analytical fault line here was the question of broken or unbroken success, and planned their answer accordingly.

Question 3

The question of Harold Godwinson's poor military leadership prompted many apparently prepared answers on why Harold lost the battle of Hastings (or, more often, why William won). Few investigated the king's military leadership and seemed unaware that he had a considerable pedigree as a commander on land and sea, or that on several previous occasions he had successfully used speed to achieve tactical surprise. While the victory at Stamford Bridge was often mentioned, many candidates attributed this to the exhaustion of the Scandinavians after Gate Fulford rather than to Harold's leadership. Most candidates seemed more comfortable discussing reasons for William's success at Hastings, noting his experiences in Normandy, the preparations for invasion, papal support and the use of cavalry. An interesting point which was often made was that Harold was on foot during the battle, which made communication with different wings of his army very difficult. Few, however, noted that medieval battles usually lasted for only a few hours. The unusual length of the battle at Hastings suggested that the final outcome was by no means predetermined.

(This page is for your first answer.) This essay will focus on whether Harold's poor leadership was the main cause of his military defeat at Hastings. This will be explored in relation to other factors, such as superior Norman tactics, favourable conditions for the Normans and the differences between armies.

On the one hand, Harold's poor leadership was the main cause of his defeat. This is shown by his decision after his victory at Stamford Bridge. Harold heard about the Norman invasion on October 1st 1066 and marched to London by October 6th. He may have been trying to surprise William, like he surprised Harold Hardrada, but this decision resulted in only those on horseback reaching London. The army of only c 7000 would have been tired from the journey. If Harold had waited longer, he could have increased the size of his army to c 30 000. However, he only waited a few days, gaining only a few hundred men and remaining at a disadvantage. In the actual battle, Harold fought on foot. This had the advantage

(This page is for your first answer.) of improving morale, but increased the significance of his poor leadership as he could not command his troops, unlike if he was on horseback.

It can be argued that the main reason that Harold was defeated was superior Norman tactics. This relates to Harold's poor leadership, as William was a strong leader who could command his forces. Normans fought on horseback, with the battle described by a historian as a "battle between 7th and 11th century tactics." The Normans also used archers, as opposed to the Anglo-Saxons who used a shield wall. Initially the shield wall was effective, though William effectively used false retreats to break it up. William also told his archers to shoot straight up, as the Anglo-Saxons were on a ridge. This was effective and shows that the Normans were able to adapt, as firing directly at them had proven ineffective. This shows that ~~another reason that~~ Norman tactics were superior to Anglo-Saxon tactics, but is related to Harold's poor leadership as they were a result of William's ability to command.

Another reason that Harold was defeated was the difference between armies. It can be argued that Harold's armies were undisciplined. This is shown by the fact that they chased the Bretons and later the Normans when they retreated. The reason

(This page is for your first answer.) for this is that the majority of Harold's army were farmers doing two months service. This contrasts with the Norman army, who were exclusively warriors. This lack of discipline was the reason the shield wall, the main Anglo-Saxon defence, failed. The rest of Harold's army was composed of his elite bodyguards, the Housecarls. It can be argued that they did not have superior training, but instead had an increased sense of identity as soldiers. The significance of this is shown as they did not break the shield wall initially. The contrasting discipline of the Norman army was evidenced at Dunes before the battle. They waited 6 weeks without plundering while waiting for the wind to change. On the other hand, when Harold's army waited for them and Harold to arrive it mostly disbanded to tend to the harvest. This shows the advantage of warriors.

Finally, it can be argued that luck was a reason. For example, the wind changed allowing Normans to enter Britain when the Anglo-Saxons were in the north, fighting Harold. Another example occurred in the battle. Rumours that William had died caused the Bretons to retreat. The less disciplined Anglo-Saxons followed, breaking the shield wall. However, it can be

(This page is for your first answer.) argued this was a result of good leadership, as William took off his helmet to show he was alive and used this tactic again.

Harold's ~~poor~~ poor leadership was the main reason for his defeat, but this was in relation to several other factors. His failure to adapt to tactics left him at a disadvantage, and his poor leadership skills meant he could not control an already undisciplined army. He also made several poor decisions leading into the battle, leaving him unprepared and weakened. William's strength and contrastingly efficient leadership skills used Harold's failures to his advantage.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer establishes some agenda at the outset. Harold's leadership qualities are exemplified through events at Hastings, but there is no consideration of his success at Stamford Bridge. Relevant factors focused on Hastings are discussed and the conclusion tries to link the stated factor to others in order to draw a conclusion. The answer is well focused and analytical in shape, with a secure range of accurate material. There is some lack of balance: it would have been helpful to compare the success of Harold's tactics against Hardrada with those used at Hastings. A high Level 4 answer.

Question 4

Most candidates for Option A2 chose Question 3 over Question 4. Few seemed aware of the nature and extent of opposition to the conquest, with only limited references to the risings of 1067 and 1068 and the Harrying of the North was not known in great detail. Many did not address the role of prominent individuals, such as Eadric the Wild, Hereward the Wake and Waltheof. Only a few pointed out that the military events of 1066 had destroyed a large section of the Saxon nobility, which had clear implications for future resistance. More able answers considered the two strands in the question, of power over England and over its people, noting, for example, the rapid building of a network of castles to confirm and establish Norman power.

Question 5

Good answers to Question 5 provided some context on Henry II's reign by referring to the conflicts of Stephen's reign and the overall decline in royal authority after the reign of Henry I. Knowledge overall seemed quite robust but the main hazard for some candidates was to impart all this information without direct reference to the question. Thus, the inquest of sheriffs and the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton were all known in detail, but their implications for royal power were often not examined. Another problem area was the restoration of royal power over the Church. Many found it difficult to understand where the religious quarrel fitted into their answer: it either dominated the response or was barely mentioned at all.

Question 6

Question 6 elicited a broad range of responses. Some described the character of King John, but without referring to the focus of the question. Most answers addressed the problems which the King faced at home rather than John's difficulties abroad. More able answers provided some relevant context with reference to the problems John inherited from Richard I and linked these to the determined opposition he faced from Philip Augustus of France. Only a few considered the importance of the interdict of 1208 and it was a little surprising that many candidates failed to examine the baronial revolt and the King's acceptance of Magna Carta in 1215.

(This page is for your first answer.)

John
capricious, arbitrary, alienated his barons
Chateau Gaillard - 2 Prong Plan - fail boats
late. Sexual appetite, Murder plot on
Way to Wales failure in Ireland
- listening to young inexperienced knights.
Killing nephew Arthur, de Brienzes
Gerard de Athle allowed de Brienzes lands.
500 Soldiers 20 Cavalry men.
Philip II

It is mostly accurate to say that John is personally responsible for the problems he faced at home and abroad during his reign. However when John came to the throne although Richard I had left a stable and centralised government, the coffers had essentially been bled dry, from the almost 3 Crusades Richard had been on. As well as this albeit due to John's treachery ~~almost~~ ^{much} of Angevin lands had been lost to the cunning Philip II king of France.

John was very capricious, he would have extreme fits of rage followed by energetic motivation and laziness. This instability was a large problem with the barons.

At home in England John faced a murder plot, planned by two barons, this resentment was personally John's fault by far. John had a large sexual appetite and would prey allegedly on barons' wives and daughters. One baron claimed to have ^{had} his daughter raped by John, ~~and~~ thus he joined with another baron also wronged by John. This time his use

(This page is for your first answer.) of mercenaries. John would alienate his barons and use mercenaries instead because he knew they would be more loyal so to speak, because they owed their wealth and position to him personally not through family lineage. However mercenaries were out of control raping and pillaging lands, which is where more grudges arose against John leading up to a murder plot as John went on an expedition to Wales, although after it was discovered and John never went to Wales.

~~However~~ the barons knew that it was the duty of a king to regain his lands so they helped Richard continually. This proves that John was the problem when barons refused to help him invade France. Although the larger reason is most likely John's failure in Normandy.

John's bad^{er} relations^{that} developed through his greedy and arbitrary personality finally showed their true fragility when his main stronghold to defend Normandy on the southern border of Maine opened its gates and surrendered to Phillip II without a fight. John called upon his barons to give him knights and resources but did not gain

(This page is for your first answer.) Much support from the nobles. However it has been shown that John could call on vast numbers of mercenaries as seen in the Brianze case where he summoned 500 soldiers and 20 cavalry men lead by Gerard de Athee his most trusted mercenary, to collect a violently refused debt.

After gaining some support John took his army to Chateau Gaillard to try and take back Normandy however this turned into a massacre after John's two pronged plan failed due to strong currents on the river, so John's fresh back up men and supplies were late. Basically John lost Normandy because Phillip had much more resources and strength. If John used and respected his barons more effectively the result may have been different.

However money was a large issue and John had no choice to raise taxes which put a lot of pressure on the

barons. Richard also had to do this and he faced no significant uprising and rebellion like John did in 1215.

(This page is for your first answer.)

The signing of the Magna Carta proved John to be personally responsible for problems faced at home and abroad because many of the clauses were to do with protecting the barons from the king's ever changing will and his unfair idea of justice.

In conclusion ~~that~~ although John was left a bankrupt throne and had no choice ^{but} to put a lot of pressure for resources, Richard also had to do this but he had the support of most of the barons proving that it is very accurate to say that the problem rested mostly with John personally. John essentially failed in the characteristics of a successful king as he couldn't prove himself in ~~the~~ warfare with the failure in Normandy, he had no charisma and ability to make alliances with his failure in Ireland and Wales. Lastly his alienative and ruthless personality earned him ~~not~~ huge unpopularity with the barons whom he needed to help him run the Empire. Eventually John even had to hand England over to the Pope so it is

(This page is for your first answer.) *definitely mostly accurate that most of the problems John faced at home and abroad were his fault personally.*



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer has a directed opening, addressing a number of domestic and foreign problems which John faced at the start of his reign. Relations with the barons are explored and a number of reasons for the loss of Normandy are provided. The conclusion attempts to apportion blame for the problems which John faced during his reign. This is a directed answer which shows an understanding of several key issues. There is balance overall in the assessment of domestic and foreign issues. Communication skills are secure overall. A low Level 5 answer.

Question 7

Several answers to Question 7 ignored the demands of the question and wrote in very general terms about the impact of the Black Death on the peasantry. More able answers included detailed knowledge on agricultural changes and increased social mobility in the countryside, along with a clear understanding of the effects of the Statute of Labourers. It is important to note that many candidates were uncertain about the effects of the Black Death on industry, towns and domestic and overseas trading patterns.

Question 8

Most candidates recognised that Question 8 was a stated factor question which required comparison of the different causes of the revolt. In some cases, the nature and impact of the poll taxes was not well known and these were skated over quite quickly in comparison to other factors. Candidates had quite secure knowledge on other causes, especially the long-term social and economic changes brought about by the Black Death. Many were able to examine other reasons such as the impact of the Royal minority, the unpopularity of John of Gaunt and Simon Sudbury, losses in the war with France and criticism of the church. Some of the more able answers hinted at a growing political awareness among the peasantry brought about by John Ball's egalitarian ideas. The more able answers linked a number of reasons to the outbreak of the revolt and went on to determine the most important reason.

Question 9

There were only a small number of answers to Question 9. Candidates generally had a good understanding of the divisions between the Armagnacs and the Burgundians and the role that division played in encouraging Henry V to invade France. This was then contrasted with a number of domestic factors. Answers dealt with Henry's security at home (with relative peace with Wales and Scotland) and his intention to end the lingering resentment of the usurpation of 1399. The more able answers saw that the divided French nobility contributed significantly to the timing of the invasion.

Question 10

There were insufficient answers to Question 10 to allow for a meaningful report.

Question 11

Question 11 was linked to the first two bullet points in the specification. The first refers to 'local rivalries of the great magnates', while the second relates to 'the period of most intense and continuous conflict', especially in the years 1459-61. Some candidates mistook the dynastic rivalry between York and Somerset as a regional division, though a great deal of this was, of course, played out at court. More able answers could cite instances of blood feuds between minor members of the regional aristocracy, often referring to the fighting between the Nevilles and the Percies over the Stanhope wedding. Most, however, did not understand the military side of the feudal order which made violence almost endemic. Several candidates failed to consider the intensity of the military conflicts after 1455, especially in the years 1459-61, with many simply listing a number of factors which led to the outbreak of conflict in 1455 at St Albans. More able candidates noted the importance of Margaret of Anjou's choice of Coventry for the Parliament of Devils and the significance of London's support for the Yorkists. There were also some secure references to the ways in which parliament prolonged the conflict with attainders and the Act of Accord.

Historians hold the belief that it was a combination of many factors that ultimately lead to the conflict known as 'the wars of the roses'; an under mighty king, over mighty nobles, the loss of the ~~100~~ hundred year war. One more prominent factor attributed to the outbreak of hostilities were the bitter regional divisions among the nobility.

Defeat in the 'Hundred year war' proved to be a major blow to the English nobility not only because of the obvious reduction in morale and pride but also the economic implications many noblemen owned land in France that was now gone, who was to blame for this? Loss of such critical territory would have caused wide spread outrage among the leading classes and could most definitely lead to a change in management however some nobles would have wanted to avoid this course of action after all Henry VI was known for rewarding those close to him handsomely.

(This page is for your first answer.)

Henry VI may have been good to those within his inner circle but many nobles became alienated, pushed away due to lack of recognition or even jealousy and as a result would have been less opposed to a new ruler, this alone would not have warranted a coup however overall the king was given power by god. And although Henry was not even handed when rewarding nobles they never went without.

To be an effective ruler you must achieve dominance over your subjects, Henry failed to do this, some noblemen could muster their own armies and indeed some actually did, they controlled vast estates and were almost never curtailed by Henry and the nobles knew this. Usurping the throne wouldn't be such a bold move if you had an angry behind you this could have given Richard an overnight noble the idea in the first place, thus sparking the 'Wars of the Roses'. To further compound this issue Henry proved himself to be 'undermighty' infirm and intellectual he was a mere shadow of his predecessor 'the warrior king' Henry V in the eyes of the nobility, losing the Calais garrison was the last reminder of Henry VI inadequacies as king. This coupled with the fact that an alliance of nobles could easily match Henry's power would have been a major factor contributing to the outbreak of hostilities in 1455.

(This page is for your first answer.)

As powerful as the nobility was it was not without flaws, rivalry and regional conflict was rife among the great families, often disputes could turn into open conflict, private wars were fought over estates and this all went on unchecked by Henry VI. The Nevilles and the Percys were the two largest families and the conflict between them was vicious, the would be King Richard chose the Nevilles as his ally and would go on to defeat Henry. Things had gotten so bad that noble families were willing to take sides and kill each other leading to the outbreak of war in 1455. Regional Divisions I could say go some way towards explaining how conflict erupted but were by no means the sole reason.

Had Henry VI not been overshadowed by characters such as Richard of York and done his duty of regulating the nobility, brokering deals and mediating talks between families then things may not have gotten to the point of war, Had Henry not proved himself incapable of leading a nation the nobility might not have become so disillusioned and disaster may have been averted.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer appears to be flawed from the outset, since the introduction refers to reasons for the outbreak of hostilities in 1455. This approach is confirmed in the rest of the answer, which means that most material is not directed on the question. There are some relevant references to local conflicts among the nobility, which allows for a low Level 3 award.

Question 12

Some very good answers to Question 12 were formed by a sustained and detailed comparison of the reasons why Edward IV was able to defeat the challenges to his rule, but Richard III was not. On Edward, there was some consideration of the roles of both Warwick and Margaret of Anjou, the intervention of Louis XI and Charles the Bald and the outcome of the battle of Barnet. Some answers then went on to consider aspects of Edward's second reign, which were not entirely relevant. Richard's reign was referenced by the princes in the tower, the growing importance of Henry Tudor and the events at Bosworth in 1485. The level of information overall suggests that candidates were more familiar with Richard's reign than that of his brother. Future candidates are advised to familiarise themselves with details of the readeption crisis, which was not apparently well known.

(This page is for your first answer.) In 1470-1471, Edward IV battled for his crown after being overthrown by Warwick. His success in defeating the challenge put to him was down to his support from foreign countries and his military skill. When his younger brother ~~was~~ Richard III faced similar issues during his reign, his lack of support & the strength of his opposition did not allow him the same victory as Edward IV.

One of the key reasons for Edward IV's successes in 1470-1471 was down to the support he received from abroad, particularly Burgundy. Having made an alliance with Burgundy during his first reign of 1461-1470, Edward was able to ~~fly to~~ ~~exile there~~ and securing this alliance with the marriage

(This page is for your first answer.) of his sister Margaret to the Duke of Burgundy, Edward was able to flee to exile there when Warwick rebelled in 1469. Furthermore, the Duke of Burgundy provided Edward with 1000 men to help him get his crown back. The support Edward ~~was~~ received from Burgundy was key in allowing him to defeat Warwick and Margaret of Anjou's armies in 1471, and return as King.

In 1485 however, Richard's opposition outweighed his support. Although the Duke of Buckingham was important in helping Richard III gain the throne, he also contributed to his downfall when he rebelled in 1483, soon after Richard was crowned. Although Richard was able to defeat Buckingham's rebellion and execute Buckingham himself, the rebellion did de-stabilise Richard as a king.

A more important threat Richard faced was from Henry Tudor. In 1485, Richard was already unstable, due to Buckingham's rebellion and the growing belief that he killed his nephews, the Princes in the Tower

(This page is for your first answer.) in order to gain his throne. ~~Therefore~~ Henry Tudor. Therefore Henry Tudor was successful in building up support for himself across England and particularly in

Wales. Even if Henry Tudor had a weak claim to the throne, his Lancastrian blood allowed him to rally large support against the Yorkist King*. The opposition Richard III faced ~~and his lack of support~~ from Henry Tudor and his foreign support led to Richard's defeat and death in 1465.

However, it could be said that Edward IV's victory in 1471 was largely down to luck. Although he had support from Burgundy, his army was much smaller than that of Warwick's and Margaret of Anjou's. However, as Margaret did not land in England on time ~~that~~ Edward faced the armies one at a time, first Warwick at the Battle of Barnet in 1471, where Warwick was killed and then Margaret of Anjou at the Battle of Tewkesbury in the same year, where Henry VI's son Edward ~~of Anjou~~ was killed. ~~Edward IV may not~~ Edward IV may not

(This page is for your first answer.) have had such a great victory if he'd faced both armies at the same time. Therefore it appears that Edward IV's victory in 1471 was partly down to his lucky situation.

Edward IV's success in the years 1470-1471 ~~seem to~~ ^{were} due to his support from abroad, and the luck in his situation in

battle. Richard III on the other hand, did not succeed in this way, due to his falling reputation and the opposition he faced in battle, even from his own side. Their difference in situation meant that Edward IV had a long reign whereas Richard III was killed by his opposition at the Battle of Bosworth in 1485.

* Furthermore, one of Richard's supporters and his army turned against him in the Battle of Bosworth whereas Henry Tudor ended up with last minute support from Lord Stanley.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The introduction establishes some features of the rest of the answer. There is some developed material on Edward IV's problems in 1469-71 and on Richard III's difficulties from the time of the Buckingham rebellion. However, there is a clear imbalance in the answer. Edward IV's success in overcoming threats to his throne are explained, but there is much less security on Richard III. Thus, although material is broadly accurate, the answer is lacking in both range and depth. A high Level 3 answer.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

If you decide to answer a question which refers to two separate points, make sure that you attempt to consider both points fairly equally.

Question 13

Most candidates addressed Question 13 with confidence and deployed a wide range of relevant material. Some of the best answers considered issues surrounding changes to Henry's security over time, or justified the statement that he was never secure on the grounds of his weak hereditary claim to the throne. This suggestion was challenged by others, who claimed that a convincing victory in battle was itself a sufficient claim to the throne of England. Those who addressed matters connected to change over time were often very successful. They referred to Henry's actions in 1485-86, avoided the trap of just commenting on Simnel and Warbeck and investigated other issues such as finance, legal changes and Henry's relations with the nobility.

Question 14

For a question focused on foreign policy, it was surprising to see many answers to Question 14 which did not engage with the four key states mentioned in the specification: Spain, France, Burgundy and Scotland. Most agreed that the essence of Henry's foreign policy was to enhance his prestige both at home and abroad. Factors such as alliances which involved favourable trade agreements, the marriage of Henry's children, payments and promises to avoid supporting Yorkist plots or harbouring pretenders were all obvious components. A number of candidates were unable to name or to reference accurately the main treaties of the reign. Some found it difficult to make clear and effective links to domestic and foreign prestige, which were both linked to the weakness of Henry's claim to be King. Domestic prestige was often confused with the idea of being popular with the people, which many candidates opted for. It might have been better to highlight the Yorkist factor, whether it was the nobles in England, or their powerful relatives and allies in Europe and on the northern border with Scotland. A strong financial position was essential for enhancing Royal prestige, so the relative wealth of the king in the eyes of nobles and merchants was also a contributory factor.

(This page is for your second answer.) How far did Henry VII foreign policy succeed in enhancing his prestige at home and abroad?

Plan

- | Did Succeed? | Didn't Succeed? |
|---|--|
| - Treaty of Etaples
↳ France, pension, truce, rebels | Warwick - Warbeck 6 years |
| - Treaty of Ayton
↳ Scotland, truce, peace | - Didn't gain lands like other kings did. |
| - Magnus + Malus Intercursus
↳ Spain, Marriage, reduce custom duties, peace, rebels.
Archbishopship Philip to sign. | - Still had to use bond & recognisances to control nobels. |
| - Burgundy trade embargo
↳ saved people money | |
| - Ransom for Margret of Anjou. | |
| - Parliament 7 times in 24 year reign. | |

(This page is for your second answer.)

Throughout Henry VII's reign foreign policy played a large role. Increasing Henry's prestige and securing his place on the throne was vital to protect his dynasty. He used a range of treaties in order to manage his foreign policy and this had effects on his reputation both home and abroad.

The elements where Henry was successful include treaties such as the Treaty of Etaples, Treaty of Ayton, Magnus and Malus' Intercursus and the trade embargo with Burgundy.

From France and the Treaty of Etaples Henry gained financially from the French pension, he gained in security by the promise from them to not protect the Yorkists and by them saying they could financially support his campaign. This would have demonstrated to the people at home that he could take control not only financially but also by them not harbouring Warbeck it would have shown his strength against rebels.

(This page is for your second answer.)

The trade embargo with Burgundy would have increased his popularity with people since it would have saved people money. Similarly, with the reduction of Exotom duties with Spain in Magnus Intercursus. This is important since increasing popularity at home would reduce the risk of further rebellion.

Henry's request for the ransom of Margaret of Anjou would have demonstrated to foreign countries that ~~the~~ rebelling against him would cost. This would have improved his reputation abroad.

The money and other elements of financial gain that Henry received from foreign policy meant that Henry didn't have to rely solely on parliamentary grants. Over his 24 year reign he met with parliament 7 times. He paid for his Scottish campaign with all his own money.

Although these elements improved the success in enhancing Henry's

(This page is for your second answer.) prestige both abroad and at home some of his foreign policy decisions had other effects.

The majority of Henry's foreign policy treaties developed due to Warbeck's rebellion. Henry had the aim of making it so Warbeck had nowhere to go since everywhere had agreed not to harbour rebels. Whilst these treaties did lead to gain it was also damaging to his reputation. Warbeck managed to run and keep up his rebellion for 6 years. This would have shown both people abroad and at home that Henry was not able to deal with threats efficiently.

Furthermore, a large majority of the treaties represented loyalty and although this increased Henry's prestige abroad his home reputation had not changed. Henry still had the use of bonds and recognisances over his nobles. This shows a lack of prestige, trust and loyalty at home since it would create a large amount of resentment.

(This page is for your second answer.)

In conclusion, although Henry's motives for the rapid increase in foreign policy may have been more directed at Warbeck it did result in a gain in several areas. The peace and financial gain meant an increase in respect both home and abroad. Therefore, he has largely succeeded in using foreign policy.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The answer has only limited range and depth of material. Henry's treaties are only listed, with some lack of clarity and inaccuracy. There is some understanding of the influence of Warbeck on Henry's foreign policy, but with insecure development. References to Henry's policies towards the nobles seems not relevant. Thus, some understanding and an attempted analysis, but supporting material is descriptive and lacking in both range and depth. Low Level 3.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Don't attempt to predict questions or create model answers based on the presumed wording of a question. This can limit revision, lead to lack of choice and/or to a lack of explicit focus, resulting in lower levels being awarded.
- Analyse causation using a variety of methods. Factors influencing causation are usually addressed with confidence but questions which require learners to weigh up the relative significance of long-term against short-term/immediate factors less so.
- Pay greater attention to the analysis of concepts other than causation; also consider the relative significance of a number of outcomes and reflect on issues concerning change over time within the period of study.
- Use historical words and phrases appropriate to the period of study and to deploy these with some fluency.
- Finally, centres are strongly advised to acquaint candidates with the format of the answer booklet before sitting the exam, particularly in which part of the booklet to write the two answers.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE